

women held in captivity. There should be no room anywhere for kidnapping. Today we heard new reports that the suspected Boko Haram gunmen kidnapped eight more girls from the Nigerian village overnight. So clearly the voices of the civilized world must rise and be louder than the terrorists who are taking away basic human rights.

Senator LANDRIEU's resolution we just passed has many supporters on it, including myself. I am also pleased to hear today the administration has committed to acting with the Nigerian Government.

As a mother and grandmother, my heart is with all those mothers and grandmothers and dads and grandfathers who want their daughters and granddaughters to come home safely. We cannot stay silent in the face of these unspeakable crimes. We are not silent today as a U.S. Senate.

I am so proud we have agreed to this resolution. I want to commend my friend Senator MIKULSKI. She and Senator COLLINS have worked on a letter we are sending to the administration. I am about to go outside to be part of a vigil, an event that has been organized by the Congressional African Staff Association as well as the Congressional Hispanic Staff Association and the Congressional Black Associates, and I am so proud of the Senate for standing for these girls. We will do everything we possibly can to get them home to their families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Boxer resolution calling for international action and aggressive action from our own government in terms of the rescue of 276 Nigerian girls who were kidnapped from a boarding school their parents paid for them to be able to go to so they could learn.

It is an outrage that these 276 girls have been captured by the terrorist group Boko Haram. It is an outrage against these girls and an outrage in the international community, and we need to speak as a nation—women and men together—saying, what is this where a girl can't go to school simply because she is a girl?

There is strong evidence that, as we speak, these girls are being sold into forced marriages and sexual slavery.

We, the women of the Senate, have written a letter on a bipartisan basis calling for the President to have the Boko Haram group placed on the international Al-Qaeda terrorist list and calling for sanctions to be imposed against them. We are heartened by the fact that the President is sending a team to help the Government of Nigeria find these girls, bring them home safely to their mothers and fathers, get the bad guys, and send an international message: Leave girls and boys alone.

There are additional rumors coming out that schools where boys had been attending, simply because they are in Western-based education, are being

burned down and that the boys' lives are in danger. What kind of world is it where a parent, based on parental choice, can't send a child to school without thinking they could be kidnapped, abused, sold into sexual slavery, and so on?

We encourage the efforts by the U.S. Government to support the capacity of the Government of Nigeria to provide security for these schools and to hold these organizations accountable. We urge timely civilian assistance from the United States and allied nations in rescuing these girls.

Many of us believe there should be a regional African coalition to go in which knows the terrain to find these girls. But our President is sending military and law enforcement people to advise the Government of Nigeria, which has been slow to respond. It is not my place to criticize another President, but I wish they would have been more aggressive in a more timely way. Now we are where we are, so I hope we pass the Boxer resolution calling for international help.

I believe we in the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, should join the international voice calling for the rescue of these girls, the return of them home safely to their mothers and fathers, to capture and punish the bad guys, and that there be an international effort to let children of the world be able to go to the school their parents choose for them to go.

I thank Senator BOXER. We are going to be working together. The women of the Senate are going to be meeting with Secretary Kerry, and I believe this is an issue worthy of our attention, worthy of our time, and worthy of our vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, May 6, 2014.

President BARACK OBAMA,  
The White House, Pennsylvania Avenue NW,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the women of the United States Senate, we are writing to you today deeply disturbed by the abduction and mistreatment of more than 200 girls by the terrorist group Boko Haram from the Government Secondary School in Chibok, Nigeria. Boko Haram has threatened to sell the girls as slaves, and some may have already been sold into child marriages. We condemn these appalling actions in the strongest possible terms, and we agree with you that the abduction of these girls is an outrage. The girls were targeted by Boko Haram simply because they wanted to go to school and pursue knowledge, and we believe the U.S. must respond quickly and definitively.

In the face of the brazen nature of this horrific attack, the international community must impose further sanctions on this terrorist organization. Boko Haram is a threat to innocent civilians in Nigeria, to regional security, and to U.S. national interests. The National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) has found that Boko Haram has engaged in multiple attacks on Westerners and repeat-

edly targeted students at schools and universities, threatening the ability of young Nigerians, particularly women, to attend school.

While we applaud the initial U.S. condemnation of the kidnapping, we believe there is much more that the U.S. government should do to make clear that such an attack will not be tolerated. We urge you to press for the addition of Boko Haram and Ansaru to the United Nations Security Council's al-Qa'ida Sanctions List, the mechanism by which international sanctions are imposed on al-Qa'ida and al-Qa'ida-linked organizations. Their addition to the List would compel a greater number of countries to sanction Boko Haram, joining several countries, such as the United States, which have already done so. General David Rodriguez, Commander of U.S. Africa Command, identified Boko Haram as an al-Qa'ida affiliate, and the Department of State reported that the group has links to al-Qa'ida in the Islamic Maghreb when it designated Boko Haram as a Foreign Terrorist Organization.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to working together until girls and women worldwide can pursue an education without fear of violence or intimidation.

Sincerely,

BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,

U.S. Senator.

SUSAN M. COLLINS,

U.S. Senator.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

##### COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about one of the great crises facing our country; that is, the high cost of college, and the fact that hundreds and thousands of young people who are bright and wish to get a higher education have now decided that, because they do not want to leave school deeply in debt, they are not going to go to college. What a loss that is, not only to the individuals and the enhancement of their own lives, but it is a loss to our Nation because in a highly competitive global economy we need the best educated workforce possible. The fact that college is becoming a distant dream—an unreachable dream—for millions of families is a horrendous situation which this Congress must address.

Over the last 10 years, the cost of attending a public 4-year college has increased by nearly 35 percent at a time when middle-class incomes have remained flat and, in fact, many families have seen a decline in their incomes. Of the students who do go to college, hundreds of thousands graduate with significant debt—on average, over \$27,000.

This morning I was talking to a staffer of mine who is \$119,000 in debt. And what was her crime? How did she accrue that debt? Did she go on a spending spree? Did she lose her money in a gambling casino? Her crime was that she wanted to go to law school, and she

came out of law school \$150,000 in debt. Today that is down to \$119,000. I have talked to doctors and dentists who are now several hundred thousand dollars in debt.

The important point to make is there was once a time in the United States when that kind of college and graduate school indebtedness did not exist. Only a few decades ago this country made a commitment to our students that if you worked hard, if you studied hard, and if you wanted to pursue a higher education, you could do so at little or no cost. That was what we used to do. Unfortunately, in that very important area we have regressed, and regressed significantly.

Until the 1970s, at the City University of New York, one of the important and best educational systems in the country, the cost was completely free. The University of California system, one of the largest and best university systems in the world, did not begin charging tuition until the 1980s. In fact, in 1965, average tuition at a 4-year public university was \$243.

We know we are living in a highly competitive global economy, and if our Nation is to succeed, we need to have the best educated workforce in the entire world. But the sad truth is we are now competing against other nations around the world that make it much easier for their young people to go to college and graduate school than is the case in the United States of America.

According to a report released last year by the OECD—the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—the United States was one of the few advanced countries in the world that did not increase its public investment in education over the last decade.

From 2008 to 2010, most advanced countries experienced significant economic decline as a result of the Wall Street collapse. Despite that, the vast majority of countries increased educational spending by 5 percent or more. The United States was one of the few nations to decrease overall educational spending.

I live about 1 hour away from Canada in northern Vermont. In Canada, average annual tuition fees were \$4,200 in 2010—roughly half of what they were in the United States—and yet the OECD says Canada is one of the most expensive countries for a student to go to school.

Germany, an international competitor of ours, is in the process of phasing out all tuition fees. Even when German universities did charge tuition, it was roughly \$1,300 per student.

According to the European Commission in 2012, the following countries do not charge their students any tuition—and these are countries we are competing against. These are countries where young people go to college without any out-of-pocket expenses. Those countries are Austria, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Scotland, and Sweden.

In Europe, university systems enjoy a very high level of public funding. The

EU average is 77 percent. In other words, in countries throughout Europe—Austria, Belgium, Denmark, and all of the rest—what governments understand is that investing in higher education is terribly important for the individual students and their families. But, in addition, it is enormously important for the competitive capabilities of those countries.

So countries such as Austria, Belgium, Denmark, each put in more than 88 percent of public funding into their universities. In the United States, the number is 36 percent. Countries all over the world that don't provide free higher education pump significantly more into their university systems than we do.

The result is several very significant points. First, we have many working-class and middle-class young people who are looking at the economic picture we face as a nation and looking at their own lives, and they are saying: Do I want to go to college and leave school \$50,000 or \$60,000 in debt? How am I going to pay off that debt once I leave school?

Many of these young people, tragically, are saying: I don't want to take that risk. I don't want to leave school deeply in debt. I will not go to college.

What a tragic situation that is for our entire country, because we are losing the intellectual potential of all of those young men and women.

Second, those who do go to college are coming out of school with an incredible chain of indebtedness around their neck, which impacts every aspect of their lives. It determines what kind of jobs they will get. Will they do the job they had hoped to do their whole lives—their life's dream, the work they were looking forward to doing or are they going to gravitate to those jobs which simply pay them a lot of money and enable them to pay off their debt?

For the first time in our country's history, American families have more student debt than credit card debt, and that is an extraordinary reality. All over this country families are struggling with debt in a way they never have before. The average loan balance for American graduates has increased by 70 percent since 2004. Average student debt is now near \$27,000. In Vermont, it is even higher at \$28,000. One in eight borrowers is carrying more than \$50,000 in student debt. The percentage of families in the United States with outstanding student debt increased from 33 percent in 2005 to 45 percent in 2010.

The bottom line here is we have a huge crisis which is impacting millions of individual families and individual young people. But from a national perspective, it is a crisis which is impacting our competitiveness in the global economy.

There was once a time, not so many years ago, when we had the best educated workforce in the world and we had a higher percentage of college graduates than any other country on Earth.

That is not the case today. I think we have got to do some very hard thinking about the crisis regarding college affordability and the crisis regarding student debt. If this country is to remain internationally competitive in the global economy, we need some bold ideas in terms of how we address these crises.

I can tell you that in Vermont, as I speak to young people around my State, this is the issue foremost on their minds. The young people in high school are wondering about how they can afford to go to college. The students in college are worried about how they are going to pay off their college debt. Our job must be to say to every young person in this country that if you are a serious student, if you study hard, you are going to be able to get a higher education regardless of the income of your family, and you are going to be able to get the best education our Nation can provide you based on your ability and not on the income of your family.

This is an issue of enormous importance to individuals around the country, but it is an issue of huge consequence for the economic future of this country. So in the coming weeks I will be introducing legislation—I know there is a lot of other good legislation that is going to be coming to the floor—because this is an issue of huge consequence, and it is an issue that must be addressed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. President.

We are on the measure again, the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill, also known as the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act—an efficiency bill. This should not be this difficult for us. When we talk about the benefits of an all-of-the-above energy policy—the benefits that can come to us as a nation when we are more resilient with our energy sources, when we are able to access our domestic energy sources, whether they be our fossil fuels, our renewables, or nuclear—we all talk about it in good, strong terms because, quite honestly, energy makes us a stronger nation, having access to our energy resources.

I have defined a good, strong energy policy as one that allows energy to be more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure. An energy policy is also about the energy we do not consume. It is about the energy we save because we are more efficient.

It seems we have gotten to a point, at least with some aspects of this discussion, where somehow or other the

efficiency side of the energy discussion is a partisan debate; that Republicans do not support energy efficiency. I cannot think of a more conservative principle than conserving energy. This is something we should be embracing, and it is something, in terms of legislation that is sound, that is good to move forward, something that I support.

This bipartisan efficiency bill has been refined. It has been strengthened. It has been improved over the past 3 years. There have been plenty of eyes upon this legislation. There has been plenty of debate about it. We have a total of 13 Senators who are now on board with it, an equal number of Republicans and Democrats. So I am pleased we have this legislation back on the floor again.

The last time this legislation came before us was in September. I spoke then about the importance, the relevance to today, the many good reasons the Senate should support it. I am not going to necessarily repeat all of those points this afternoon, but I do want to highlight quickly a couple of the main points.

The first is going directly to the policy side of it. Energy efficiency should be a broader part of our Nation's energy policy. It is good for our economy. It is good for the environment. It enables us to waste less, to use our resources more wisely. Who can object to this? Who could possibly say this is not a good thing we should encourage?

And there is more. Think about what it does to help create jobs and deliver financial benefits. Study after study shows we can save billions of dollars every year through reasonable efficiency improvements. Whether we are talking about small appliances or large buildings, there are opportunities for gains in efficiencies throughout the system.

The second reason for support of the bill is it envisions a more limited role for the Federal Government. When I think about efficiency, I think the Federal Government should seek to fulfill three key roles. It can act as a facilitator of information that consumers and businesses need. It can serve as a breaker of barriers that discourage or prevent rational efficiency improvements. As the largest consumer of energy in our country, it can lead by example by taking steps to reduce its own energy usage.

This legislation helps us make progress in all of these areas, but it is appropriately tailored as well. It has a number of voluntary provisions. It does not contain any new mandates for the private sector. I think that is worthy of repeating. There are no new mandates in this bill.

When the legislation was first introduced some time ago, there was some concern about impact on building codes. But the provision related to model building codes is voluntary. It is not mandatory. No one has to benefit from it if they do not want to.

The third reason to support the bill is the cost—or, really, the lack of cost.

We all know we are operating in a time of high deficits and record debt. The good news is this efficiency bill actually subtracts from our spending rather than adding to it. The CBO has indicated it will yield a modest savings of about \$12 million over the 10-year window. Again, this is good from a policy perspective. It is good from a fiscal perspective.

Then the last point is one I want to make in support of process. We have followed regular order, as well as “regular order” can be defined around here, but we have done that from the beginning with this legislation. Those of us who serve on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee reported it on an overwhelming bipartisan basis back in 2011, and then again in 2013. So it has gone through a fulsome committee process. Improvements were suggested and have been thoughtfully considered and incorporated. Many, many of the ideas are now incorporated in the text we have in front of us.

Then, finally, a few words about the amendments that are being filed to this bill.

When we last had this bill before the Senate, we were unable to reach agreement on amendments. We got bogged down and the bill was pulled from the floor. The Senate moved on to other matters. We are back again now, and I really do not want to see a repeat of that experience. Quite honestly, we do not need to.

It is certainly true a lot of amendments have been filed to the bill. We had more than 100 last September. That should not be evidence that somehow this bill is flawed. But what it recognizes is there is this pent-up demand for a discussion on the issue of energy. There is a pent-up demand to bring forward ideas and concepts and innovation and policy when it comes to energy debate.

It has been more than 6 years since we have had anything more than a brief debate. When you think about what has happened in the energy sector in the past 6 years, I say to the Presiding Officer, you are sitting in the chair coming from a State that has seen an amazing—an amazing—boom when it comes to natural gas production in your State. You have seen technologies come in that are able to access areas where you did not even know you had the resource.

Think about the changes we have seen in the energy sector in 6 years. Six years ago we were talking about building LNG import terminals—terminals so we could bring LNG in from other countries. Now we are pressing the case for greater LNG exports. We are trying to build out more facilities so we can move this abundant resource from our shores to help our friends and allies around the world.

Six years ago, if I had stood on this floor and suggested to you we were going to have a debate about the export of our crude oil from this country, you would have laughed me off the

floor. Nobody was talking about it. But look at what is happening, coming out of the Bakken up in North Dakota, what is coming out of Texas and New Mexico and out of California, Colorado, out of States in the Midwest. We are producing like we have not produced in ages. We are doing so because we have the benefit of good, strong technologies that are allowing us to access a resource safely and making sure we are being good stewards of the land while we are doing it, and creating jobs and opportunities.

So when you think about what has happened in 6 years, and the fact that we have not had a real debate and conversation about energy, it is no wonder people want to present amendments. But we are in a situation now where there is real debate about whether we are going to have any amendments at all.

We have been sitting here in the Senate since last July—almost a year—and there have been nine amendments allowed of the Republicans' choosing to be heard, to be entertained, to be taken up on the floor of the Senate.

We are not asking for an unreasonable number. Given everything that is going on in the world, everything that is happening in the energy sector, it is understood why we would want an opportunity to present amendments. But we are not asking for the Moon here. Out of all the amendments filed to the bill, we are seeking votes on four of them. If we were to take just 15 minutes per vote, with a little extra time for statements in support or opposition, we could work those out in an afternoon.

There is no reason we need to stretch this out. Our other option is to spend the next several days arguing about whether we are going to vote at all. We are sent to the Senate to do good work, and this is a venue where the work is demanding attention, so let's get to it.

Let's advance these measures. Let's get to the debate about whether it is LNG export opportunities, whether it is the advantage from many different perspectives about the Keystone XL Pipeline, and about what more we can be doing as a nation to be a world leader with our energy resources, accessing our resources for the good of Americans, the creation of jobs to strengthen our economy, to help our trade deficit, to help our friends, and to help our allies. We can be in a position to do so much more, but we have to be able to get beyond the discussion, the debate about whether we are just going to talk about whether we are going to talk about it or whether we are going to get to it.

I am hopeful that throughout the afternoon, throughout tomorrow, and throughout the balance of the week we will have an opportunity to discuss and to vote on amendments that are energy-related amendments that will help move this country in a more positive direction when it comes to our energy policy and attach that to a fundamental anchor of a good, strong energy

policy, which is energy efficiency, and that is what the Shaheen-Portman bill allows us to do.

#### NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

I want to pivot for a moment and move off the issue of energy efficiency. I wish to speak for a few more minutes this afternoon about National Police Week.

National Police Week is a week to honor our fallen law enforcement officers. It occurs next week. Next week in Washington, DC, we will see police vehicles from all over the Nation. We will see officers in uniform, perhaps some with young kids in tow, flooding the Metro system. The survivors of law enforcement tragedies will gather in Alexandria, VA, for the annual meeting of Concerns of Police Survivors.

On Tuesday night, tens of thousands will gather at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, and they will read by candlelight the names inscribed on the memorial walls this year. On Thursday, the National Peace Officers Memorial Day Service will convene on the west front of the Capitol. These are all very moving tributes to our fallen, those who have served in the line of duty and who honor us all.

For the past 11 years, I have made it a habit of honoring the fallen during National Police Week, regardless of whether any Alaska law enforcement agency suffered a line-of-duty death during that preceding year.

At times I have made note of a sad coincidence, a sad coincidence that law enforcement tragedies in the twos and threes often seem to occur in close proximity to the annual National Police Week observance.

About this time 8 years ago, the National Capital Region was grieving the loss of Michael Garbarino and Vicky Armel, the first Fairfax County police officers to die from gunfire in the line of duty. In April 2009, Pittsburgh lost three of its finest.

This year, as we anticipate the arrival of National Police Week, Alaska carries that tragic burden. Last week my home State lost two members of the Alaska State Troopers in a single incident.

On May 1, Alaska State troopers Sergeant Scott Johnson and Trooper Gabe Rich flew from Fairbanks to the village of Tanana. Tanana is an Athabascan Indian community and there are about 238 people. Tanana sits at the confluence of the Yukon and Tanana Rivers. It is a strong community, it is a resilient community, but it is a community that is truly suffering right now.

Similar to most of the Alaska Native villages, the only full-time law enforcement presence in Tanana is a single, unarmed village public safety officer. Law enforcement backup, when they are needed and called in, will fly to Tanana. Tanana is not accessible by roads, so basically the only way in and out is to fly in and out, coming in from Fairbanks, so it is about a 1-hour flight away.

The village public safety officer asked for trooper assistance to respond to an individual who had been waving a gun in the village. With no backup, other than the unarmed village public safety officer, Sergeant Johnson and Trooper Rich attempted to serve a warrant on the offender. Both officers were shot and killed. The 19-year-old son of the individual who was the subject of the warrant is now charged with the shooting.

This is a horrible tragedy for Tanana, a tragedy for Alaska, and a tragedy for the entire law enforcement community.

Tanana is, as I mentioned, a small village. It is an isolated village. It has been a very resilient village. It is a very proud and a very kind-hearted community. The Athabascan word for Tanana, known as "Nuchalawoya," means "wedding of the rivers," and the village has played a very central role in Athabascan culture for thousands of years.

But like many Alaska Native villages, it suffers from drug and alcohol problems. Last October there was a group of young people from the village of Tanana, and they traveled to the Alaska Federation of Natives convention.

It is the largest gathering of Alaska Natives in the State, and they did a very brave and heroic thing. They assembled on stage in front of 4,000 to 5,000 people to tell Alaskans that they had had enough of the pain and the violence, and they were determined to make their community a healthier place. It was an amazing moment. It was inspiring. There was not a sound to be heard in the huge Carlson Center in Fairbanks as these young people spoke.

So inspiring were the words of these young kids that I wrote Attorney General Holder and I asked that his department invest prevention resources in the village and others like it that were trying to turn things around, trying to face the ugly side of what happens in a small community when we have domestic violence and child sexual assault brought on by drugs and alcohol.

Tanana is absolutely devastated by what happened last week. In the words of Cynthia Erickson, who is the youth leader of the young people I mentioned, last week's incident amounts to two steps back in Tanana's effort to heal itself, but the healing process must begin and now is the time for it to begin.

We remember fallen law enforcement officers for the way they lived their lives. Vivian Eney Cross, who is the widow of a fallen U.S. Capitol police officer, said:

It is not how these officers died that made them heroes, it is how they lived.

In that spirit I wish to share with the Senate a little about the lives of our two fallen Alaskan heroes.

Sergeant Johnson was born in Fairbanks, and he grew up in the small community of Tok, which is 150-plus miles out of Fairbanks on the road sys-

tem. He went to school in the Tok community, and he was a wrestler. He joined the Alaska State Troopers in 1993 after serving as a North Slope Borough police officer.

Sergeant Johnson spent his entire 20-year trooper career in Fairbanks, where he rose through the ranks to supervise the Areawide Narcotics Team and ultimately the Interior Rural Unit. Sergeant Johnson also was an accomplished canine handler and a leader of the regional SWAT team. We call it SERT in Alaska, the Special Emergency Reaction Team.

His final assignment was leader of the Interior Rural Unit, a team of four who respond to incidents in 23 Native villages. Sergeant Johnson assumed that role this year. His territory covered hundreds of miles end-to-end. Again, these are hundreds of miles without road access.

Sergeant Johnson was 45 years old. He is survived by his wife, daughters aged 16, 14, and 12, and also survived by his parents and siblings.

Trooper Gabe Rich was born in Pennsylvania. He moved to Fairbanks shortly after he was born. He graduated from Lathrop High School in 2006. He was 26 years old at the time of his death.

Trooper Rich spent 4 years working as a patrolman with the North Pole Police Department before deciding to become an Alaska State Trooper in 2011. He is survived by his fiancé, their 1-year-old son, and his parents. He was in the process of adopting his fiancé's 8-year-old boy.

Sergeant Johnson and Trooper Rich were known to those who watched the popular National Geographic series "Alaska State Troopers." Undoubtedly, those who have watched the two in action are also grieving the loss, along with the people of Tanana and all of Alaska.

I think I speak for all in this body when I say we are shocked and we are saddened by the events in Tanana last week. On behalf of a grateful Senate and a grateful nation, I take this opportunity to extend my condolences to all who held Sergeant Johnson and Trooper Rich deep in their hearts.

With that, I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The majority leader.

**Mr. REID.** We are going to have, as indicated, a briefing on Ukraine at 5:30 this evening. I alert all Senators we will do our utmost to start at 5:30, and we must end at 6:30. We need everybody on time. If I am there on time, I am going to start it on time, and I will do my utmost to be there on time. People can be called upon for questions in the order they show up at the meeting.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

**Mr. REID.** I ask unanimous consent that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate recess until 6:30 p.m. tonight for the purpose of an all-Senators briefing.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

Without objection.

## KIDNAPPING OF SCHOOLGIRLS IN NIGERIA

Mr. REID. I have had a number of titles, as all we Senators have over the years, but the title that means the most to me has always been "Dad," "Father." It is so important that my five children recognize me as their dad.

My oldest child is a daughter, Lana, but I also have 12 granddaughters. As a father and grandfather, I can't imagine the horror of having one of these girls abducted, kidnapped, and stolen—even though Nigeria is thousands of miles away from where we sit today.

My nightmare, our nightmare—we are always worrying about our girls—is a reality in Nigeria.

On the night of April 14, more than 250 girls—I don't know the exact number—were stolen from a school by a terrorist group called Boko Haram. These kidnappers, a cowardly group of men—thugs and terrorists—have announced their attention to sell the girls in the marketplace.

It was only yesterday the leader of this organization was on television saying we have them and we are going to sell them. How would that make a mother or dad, family member feel? It is sickening to think these girls are at the mercy of these slavers. These are terrible reports. Some say—some of the reports we get—some of the girls have already been sold into Chad and Cameroon. I hope that is wrong.

So I, with my colleagues, join with the rest of the world in renouncing these heinous acts.

We must remember that this crime is only one of the many acts of terrorism of this awful group Boko Haram. They have done it before against children, against civilians.

Today the United States offered its assistance to rescue these girls. Great Britain has done the same, and other countries have as well. Nigeria, in my opinion, has been reticent to receive help. That is not my opinion, but that is what the public reports say. We want to help rescue these girls. We have some assets the Nigerians don't have, as do the Brits and others who want to help.

I am concerned the Nigerian Government's response to this crime and to dealing with Boko Haram is very tepid. Nigeria has missed opportunities to collaborate with international partners to fight terrorism in this instance and other instances. Instead of carrying out its own operation—which has been very clumsy, and there has been a disregard for human rights—they should let us help. Let the world community help.

The Nigerian Government has been disastrously slow in responding to these incidents—not on this one but on others. I urge the Nigerian Government to use all of its resources and accept international assistance to bring the abductors to justice. The world is watching. Return these daughters to their families.

Today we adopted S. Res. 433, which condemned this abduction, to add our

voices to those calling for their release. I especially thank Senator MARY LANDRIEU of Louisiana and all other cosponsors for their hard work on this legislation. The Senate, along with the rest of the world, will continue to do all we can to help our Nigerian friends. We continue to hope and pray for the safe return of these girls to their moms and dads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in recess count postclosure on the legislation that is now being considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I very rarely am motivated to come to the floor simultaneously with current events, thinking that it is important to reflect and learn as much as possible about a subject before one begins to orate about it on the Senate floor. I am making an exception, however, because of the extraordinarily heinous acts that have occurred in the country of Nigeria.

I think it takes everyone's breath away in the United States of America that a terrorist organization—Boko Haram—would attack a secondary school in northeastern Nigeria and kidnap 200 girls. Most of these girls are not that much younger than my daughters. These were young women who wanted nothing more than to get an education. We are now told these terrorists have proudly proclaimed they will enslave these young women, they will sell them as slaves. They are proudly taking credit for this despicable and inhumane act.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI and Senator COLLINS for organizing a letter to the President to urge him to include Boko Haram in the United Nations Al Qaeda sanctions list. I thank the other Senators who introduced the resolution we passed this afternoon condemning this attack. But we have to do more.

It concerns me, honestly, that this is occurring in a country where the leader not too long ago signed into law a measure that anyone entering into a homosexual relationship can be imprisoned for up to 14 years. In this same country we have a terrorist organization capturing young women and enslaving them for dollars to be child brides, proudly proclaiming that it is a sin for these young women to want to get an education, that this action was necessary to purge them of their sins and marry them off.

I understand it takes all kinds of people to make up this great world. I understand there are all kinds of beliefs.

But it is very hard for me to get my arms around the notion that there could be any faith that would believe kidnapping young women by the hundreds and selling them as indentured slaves to men could ever be part of any kind of faith that we should recognize. These are not people of faith; these are heinous criminals. I believe our country should look at them as arch-enemies of who we are as a nation and what we stand for as a government.

The name of this organization means "Western education is a sin." Respect for young women is not a sin. Wanting an education is not a sin. The opportunity to better oneself is not a sin.

These incredible crimes that have been committed should not go unanswered, and I think it is incumbent on our Nation, with the great resources we have, to make sure we send the appropriate message to the world that this is Al Qaeda and this is our enemy—not just to our values and our way of life but, importantly, an enemy to innocent young women.

I wanted to come to the floor to make this statement because I cannot imagine how the parents of these young girls must be feeling and how helpless the feeling must be. I can only hope and pray that the Government of Nigeria realizes this is a moment of truth for them. Will they stand up to this kind of extremism that is not faith? They do a disservice to their professed faith by these actions. Can this country stand up to them, can we help them stand up to them and, most importantly, can we do anything to save these young women?

When I go to bed tonight I will, in my faith, thank God for my family and my children, and I will also ask for prayers for these young women in hopes they can be rescued, that they can be reunited with their desire to get educated, and that their families will not have to spend days wondering if they will ever see their children again or if their children will even survive.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support S. 2262, the Shaheen-Portman Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2014. The reason I do so is because I have long felt we can't be for an all-of-the-above energy policy if we aren't promoting state-of-the-art approaches in terms of energy efficiency.

I think the Presiding Officer and I both know it isn't even a speech here in the Senate on energy policy unless the Senator says they are for an all-of-the-above at least three times every 15, 20 minutes. So I think what Senator

SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN are doing is making it clear right at the start that an all-of-the-above energy policy is their approach and their effort to pull as many as possible colleagues into innovative approaches in terms of promoting energy efficiency.

Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN have been tirelessly pursuing this legislation for 3 years now. I had a chance as the former Chair of the Energy Committee to watch what they have been doing. I will walk back a bit to make sure colleagues understand how constructive their efforts have been, both substantively and in terms of promoting collaboration here in the Senate, in hopes that these commonsense energy proposals for creating good jobs and a cleaner and healthier environment will prevail on a bipartisan basis here in the Senate.

With our colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, I have had a front-row seat over the last couple years to watch Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN in action and support their efforts. I think we should all be very appreciative of the job our new Chair, Senator LANDRIEU, is doing—again, in concert with Senator MURKOWSKI—because the two of them continue the committee's tradition, No. 1, of working in a bipartisan way but, No. 2, trying again to promote collaboration here within the Senate to promote an energy approach, which I think is not only common sense but it is absolutely essential in order to be able to go on to the other energy policy issues that surely are likely to be more contentious than energy efficiency.

To walk back a bit through what has happened, I think our colleagues know an earlier version of this legislation passed our Energy and Natural Resources Committee last year by an overwhelming bipartisan majority. It was then considered on the floor this past September, but it was blocked by demands for a vote on a health care amendment which had nothing to do with the premise of the underlying bill. I happen to oppose that amendment, but however a Senator feels, it has nothing to do with energy efficiency and productivity.

When the bill stalled on the Senate floor last fall, it looked pretty grim for the cause of energy efficiency, and essentially people were questioning the Senate's ability to consider an act on a range of energy issues which confront our country. I think a lot of people would have thrown in the towel at that point. They would have said: We put in all of this work and effort to win such a strong bipartisan vote in the Senate; then we were ready to go to the floor and faced unrelated issues. And I could see why the sponsors would give up. But Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN are not throw-in-the-towel type of Senators, and in effect they doubled down and went back to work on some of the most challenging issues.

So at that point, after the unfortunate setback of last September, they in

effect doubled down and worked to bring an even broader range of Members and stakeholders together here in the Senate to form a consensus and make this bill even better, improve the array of commonsense approaches taken to promote energy efficiency, and increase the chance of the best possible energy efficiency bill becoming law.

I wish to highlight at this point how challenging this work was and how pleased I was the Senate was able to get together.

At that point one of the most challenging issues dealt with the question of the then-existing requirements that new Federal buildings be designed to phase out their use of fossil-fuel-generated energy by 2030. This is important for a variety of reasons. Of course, the Federal Government is a major property owner in our country, No. 1. And No. 2, I think we all look to the Federal Government at a minimum to try to set some examples in terms of trying to deal with these issues.

In other words, it is fine for Washington, DC, to say: Everybody else would do X, Y, and Z. But if they come back and say the Federal Government is not willing to set an example, it is pretty hard to have any credibility in terms of that particular field of public policy. The reality was that while well meaning, the existing requirement that new Federal Government buildings be designed to phase out their use of fossil-fuel-generated energy by 2030 was not working particularly well by anyone's calculus.

We had folks in the natural gas industry raising questions about whether they would be able to participate. They made the point—one that I think certainly has validity—that natural gas is 50 percent cleaner than the other fossil fuels. They were saying: Well, how are we going to be able to play a role with heating in Federal buildings, which, of course, as I indicated, is very significant both because the Federal Government owns so much property and because of the example the Federal Government sets.

So reaching an agreement on how to balance repeal of this provision in existing law—well meaning, but not working very well—with the addition of provisions to enhance efficiency in Federal buildings involved innumerable meetings—meetings that I participated in personally and others were involved in that went on literally for months with all of the stakeholders—the electric and gas utility industries, the environmental advocacy organizations, the energy efficiency groups—all of them in discussions that took place over conference calls and in-person meeting after meeting.

I would submit that had those groups not been able to come together—and I believe they deserve great credit because they did—I think it may have been right at that point very difficult to advance this bill because we would have generated, for the first time, sig-

nificant opposition around the core issue. Whether it be environmental groups or electric and gas groups, we would have had significant friction over an important public policy issue, which is how to promote renewable energy to the greatest extent possible in new Federal Government buildings.

I will say to colleagues who may be following this, a number of times in these discussions I thought things were going to blow up. I thought one or more of these groups would walk out and say: We will take our chances on the floor; we believe we are going to win, and if it takes this bill down, so be it. But they stayed at the table and they worked out an agreement.

As a result of their agreement—environmental organizations, those in the advocacy of energy efficiency and a variety of industry groups—the effort produced a significantly better bill, and a bill that now includes some very important and powerful additions.

For example, as a result of rewriting the provision that new Federal Government buildings be designed to phase out the use of fossil-fuel-generated energy, very substantial financial savings were generated so as to be able to include some very sensible and potentially far-reaching changes in the energy efficiency field. For example, as a result of that agreement it is possible to take some of the financial savings generated in that redo of the requirements for renewable fuels in Federal energy building and include in the legislation that is now before the Senate, the SAVE Act, a bipartisan proposal championed by our colleagues Senator ISAKSON and Senator BENNET. This provision would for the first time facilitate the accounting of energy efficiency in residential mortgages. A report by the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy and the Institute for Market Transformation estimates that this proposal alone would create 83,000 new jobs in home construction, renovation, and manufacturing by 2020. These are jobs for American workers that cannot be outsourced. The agreement on Federal building efficiency would also extend the 3 percent-per-year Federal building efficiency target through 2017 and expand the coverage of this efficiency target from new buildings to include major renovations as well.

So what we have is a good bill that got out of committee. It was a good bill last September that I would have liked to have seen pass this body at that time. After it was not possible to move it forward, we had the chief sponsors, Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN, work continually to try to advance this legislation and broaden its appeal. When they bumped up against a really serious problem, which was to fix this policy with respect to the requirements for renewable energy in Federal buildings, they worked with a variety of groups and organizations and were able to make the bill better.

I wish to thank a number of Senators who were behind this effort to redo the



requirements for new Federal buildings—in particular, our colleagues on this side of the aisle, Senator MANCHIN and Senator WHITEHOUSE, and on the other side of the aisle I wish to thank Senator HOEVEN. They were very involved in the nuts and bolts of redoing this legislation. Suffice it to say that the three of them would be the first to say they don't agree on every possible energy policy subject matter. Yet the three of them came together, worked with this coalition of groups I have described, and made significant improvements in the already good bill after September. As a result of their work, we have generated financial savings that made it possible to include the Isakson-Bennet legislation on residential mortgages, which is a very significant and positive development in the energy efficiency field.

This is not a small matter, taking bold steps to improve energy efficiency in residential mortgages the way our colleagues Senator ISAKSON and Senator BENNET have done in a bipartisan fashion. The reason this efficiency legislation is back is because it is sensible and has bipartisan appeal. It is about cutting waste and creating jobs. Passing this legislation would be the biggest step in years toward tapping the enormous potential of energy efficiency, which is the most sensible and cheapest energy source America has.

Here are the most relevant figures with respect to the benefits of this bill. The bill will save about 2.8 billion megawatt hours of electricity by 2030, according to the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy. To translate this into something people can put their arms around, if we are going to generate 2.8 billion megawatt hours—and that is the projection for this bill—our country would have to build 10 new nuclear powerplants, at a cost of billions of dollars each, and run them for more than 20 years. An additional provision of the bill updates and promotes voluntary model building codes, making residential and commercial buildings more efficient through the installation of new equipment, insulation, and other efficiency technologies. There is money to be saved and there is energy to be saved. That is the kind of work this legislation accomplishes.

What I have described is possibly not the most flashy of stories we might be contemplating here in Washington. It might not be at the top of every single account on the nightly news, but businesses understand how valuable this is. Businesses understand that there is money to be made here. That is why more than 250 companies and associations endorse the bill, including the chamber of commerce, which I think would be the first to state that they don't see themselves as a bleeding heart environmental organization. I was struck by a headline in *forbes.com* not long ago that read "The Shaheen-Portman Energy Savings Act: It's the economy, stupid." *Forbes*, a prominent business publication, got it right.

If Congress can pass this bill, it would immediately become one of the largest job-creating efforts the Senate will enact this year, creating an estimated 192,000 new jobs by 2030. It can also make a tremendous difference in our country's economic competitiveness, bringing savings to businesses and families, reducing demands on our electric grid, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Having watched the development of this legislation as the former chair of the Energy Committee and now chair of the Finance Committee, I think every Member of the Senate understands how important it is to secure a cleaner, more efficient, job-creating energy future. This legislation provides that opportunity. It was a good bill when the Senate considered it last September, it is an even better bill tonight, and to a great extent it is made better because colleagues such as Senator JOE MANCHIN and Senator SHELTON WHITEHOUSE and Senator HOEVEN have worked together on a very contentious matter involving renewable energy in Federal buildings. It is the latest demonstration of good will and comity that has dominated this debate, at least as it relates to the substance of discussing energy efficiency legislation.

I thank our chair Senator LANDRIEU for the first-rate job she has done not only on this but on the matters before the Energy Committee. I also thank my good friend and colleague Senator MURKOWSKI for the same sorts of efforts she made to work with me as the chair and Senator LANDRIEU. I think those efforts are going to pay off. Let's make sure they pay off immediately with the Senate this week moving forward and passing the bipartisan Shaheen-Portman legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Georgia.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY WALKER, JR.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a dear friend of mine who last Friday, at the joint spring meeting in Las Vegas, received the American Bar Association's Solo, Small Firm and General Practice Division's 2014 Lifetime Achievement Award.

Larry Walker is a lawyer in Perry, GA. He is a lifetime resident of Perry and went back to his hometown of Perry to practice in 1965. I am so proud that Larry has been recognized by his peers—of which I am one, as a practicing lawyer in Georgia before I came into government. Larry epitomizes what lawyers look to when you think of someone who is a good lawyer.

The award he received recognizes solo and small firm attorneys who are widely accepted by their peers as having significant lifetime distinction, exceptional achievement, and distinction in an exemplary way. Winners are viewed by other solo and small firm practitioners as epitomizing the ideals

of the legal profession of solo and small firm practitioners.

Larry began his law career, as I say, in 1965 when he came back to Perry to practice law. He became a judge of the Perry Municipal Court at the age of 23. In 1972 Larry ran for the General Assembly of Georgia and won the seat that was formerly held by soon-to-be Senator Sam Nunn. He served in the General Assembly until 2005. In 1986 he was elected majority leader of the Georgia House of Representatives and served in that capacity for 16 years. He was the founding member of Walker, Hulbert, Gray & Moore and served as chair of the State Legislative Leaders Foundation. Larry also represented Georgia's Eighth Congressional District on the Georgia Department of Transportation from 2007 to 2009, and in August of 2009 he was appointed by then-Governor Sonny Perdue to the University System of Georgia Board of Regents, where he continues to serve today.

Larry writes a weekly column for the Houston, GA, Home Journal and is the author of a book entitled "Life on the Gnat Line," a composition of Larry's widely read columns on family, everything southern, reading, politics, and, of course, just folks. Larry is a frequent speaker at various community and State events, including continuing legal education seminars.

Larry has been my dear friend for over 30 years. He is not just a great lawyer, he is a great guy. He and I have had the opportunity to knock down a quail bird or two in the woods of South Georgia. We have had discussions late into the night over politics and life in general. Larry is one of those individuals who make life fun and who are a pleasure to be around, and that is why I am so excited the American Bar Association has seen fit to recognize Larry's talents, his hard work, his dedication, and his integrity to the law profession. He has been successful not because he moved to his hometown where he was well known; he has been successful because he is looked at as someone who possesses all the finest characteristics a lawyer can hope to have.

I am indeed privileged to call him a dear friend. I am indeed privileged to have an opportunity to say to Larry and to his wife Janice, congratulations. This kind of award shows that people all across this great country recognize you, Larry, for the great work you have done in our profession for all of these years since you first hung out your shingle in June of 1965.

# RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess until 6:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:30 p.m., recessed until 6:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BLUMENTHAL).